

Title	Risk Based Inspection - A Case Study Evaluation of Onshore Process Plant	
Publisher/Author	HSE	
Publication Date	2002	
Executive Summary	<p>Risk based inspection (RBI) as a method for prioritising the inspection of plant has received considerable attention over the last few years and methods have been developed nationally, for example by the American Petroleum Institute (API) and by a number of private organisations, particularly in the petrochemical industry. A coordinated approach to these developments is currently underway in Europe (RIMAP).</p> <p>A survey of approximately 50 UK organisations carried out by HSL in 1999 showed that approximately half were using an approach to plant inspection based on risk. It was clear however, that a wide range of systems were in use including commercial software packages and in-house systems specific to individual plants. Given the disparate nature of some of these systems and the likelihood that RBI assessments might produce very different results depending on which methodology was used, HSE took the view that a study should be undertaken using a number of example cases to tease out the differences between the systems.</p> <p>This is the subject of the current investigation. The work (Programme JR32082) has been jointly funded by HSE's Technology Division (TD) and the Hazardous Installations Directorate (HID). The programme was essentially in two parts. Firstly, a case study round robin was undertaken by HSL, the subject of this report, and secondly, a review of European developments has been carried out by Mitsui Babcock Technology, the details of which are reported in Reference 8.</p>	
Table of Contents	1. Introduction..... 2. The participants..... 3. Case studies..... 4. Methodologies..... 4.1 Participant A 4.2 Participant B 4.3 Participant C 4.4 Participant D 5.5 Participant E..... 4.6 Participant F..... 4.7 Participant G 5. Evaluations..... 5.1 Case 1 Molecular Sieve 5.1.1 Participant A 5.1.2 Participant B 5.1.3 Participant C 5.1.4 Participant D 5.1.5 Participant E 5.1.6 Participant F 5.1.7 Participant G 5.1.8 Summary 5.1.8.1 Likelihood..... 5.1.8.2 Consequences 5.1.8.3 Risk..... 5.1.8.4 Inspection Plan and Period 5.2 Case 2 Distillate Hydrotreater..... 5.2.1 Participant E 5.2.2 Participant F 5.2.3 Participant C	1 1 1 2 2 3 3 4 5 6 7 8 8 8 11 11 11 11 12 14 15 15 15 17 17 18 19 19 19 20

5.2.4 Summary	20
5.2.4.1 Likelihood.....	20
5.2.4.2 Consequences	21
5.2.4.3 Inspection Plan and Period	21
5.3 Case 3 Autoclave	21
5.3.1 Participant B	21
5.3.2 Participant A	22
5.3.3 Participant F	23
5.3.4 Participant E	23
5.3.5 Participant C	24
5.3.6 Summary	24
5.3.6.1 Likelihood.....	24
5.3.6.2 Consequences	25
5.3.6.3 Risk.....	25
5.3.6.4 Inspection Plan and Period	26
5.4 Case 4 Methanol Storage Drum.....	26
5.4.1 Participant F	26
5.4.2 Participant E	27
5.4.3 Participant C	27
5.4.4 Summary	27
5.4.4.1 Likelihood.....	27
5.4.4.2 Consequences	27
5.4.4.3 Risk, Inspection Plan and Periodicity	27
6. Discussion.....	28
6.1 Introduction.....	28
6.2 Likelihood analysis	29
6.3 Consequences and Risk	29
6.4 Inspection Plan and Period	30
6.4.1 Mitsui Babcock review of inspection recommendations	31
7. Conclusions.....	33
8. Recommendations for further work	34
9. References.....	35
Appendix 1 Data Requirements	
Appendix 2 Case 1 Molecular Sieve	
Appendix 3 Case 2 Distilate Hydrotreater	
Appendix 4 Case 3 Autoclave	
Appendix 5 Case 4 Methanol Storage Drum	
Appendix 6 Case 1 Mol. Sieve additional information	
Appendix 7 Case 1 Mol. Sieve additional information 2	